UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/790,829	03/03/2004	Steven Peers	118922	4379	
25944 OLIFF & BER	7590 02/06/2008 RIDGE PLC	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 320	850		MIRZADEGA	MIRZADEGAN, SAEED S	
ALEXANDRI	A, VA 22320-4850		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2144		
	•	·	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/06/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<u> </u>		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/790,829	PEERS, STEVEN		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Saeed S. Mirzadegan	2144		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address		
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of the may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  (6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirgonial apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 Ma</u>	arch 2004			
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3)[	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.		
Dispositi	on of Claims				
5) 6) 7)	Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> are subject to restriction and/or expressions.				
Applicati	on Papers				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed onis/ are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) [ ] a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priorical application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage		
2) Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

10/790,829 Art Unit: 2144

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - Claims 1-13, 20, drawn to a control system, classified in class 709, subclass 221.
  - II. Claims 14-19, 21, drawn to an aero-engine system and a method of configuring networked aero-engines, classified in class 701, subclass 100.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention I has separate utility such as a control system for configuration of a plurality of networked input and output devices. Invention II has a separate utility such as aero-engine (aircraft engine) thrust and acceleration settings and controls. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
- 3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

10/790,829 Art Unit: 2144

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

- 4. Numerous telephone calls were made to Attorney of record James Oliff, Reg. No. 27,075 on 01/31/2008 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.
- The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Application/Control Number:

10/790,829 Art Unit: 2144

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

10/790,829

Art Unit: 2144

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saeed S. Mirzadegan whose telephone number is 571-270-3044. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on 571-272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

sm

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100